

Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia



**INTERMEDIATE QUALITY REPORT
EU-SILC 2007 OPERATION
IN LATVIA**

Riga 2008

CONTENTS

Background.....	4
1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators.....	4
2. Accuracy.....	6
Sampling design.....	6
2.1.1. Type of sample design.....	6
2.1.2. Sampling units.....	6
2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria.....	7
2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria.....	7
2.1.5. Sample selection schemes.....	7
2.1.6. Sample distribution over time.....	8
2.1.7. Renewal of sample: Rotational groups.....	8
2.1.8. Weightings.....	8
2.1.8.1. Design factor.....	8
2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments.....	9
2.1.8.3. Adjustments to external data (level, variables used and sources).....	9
2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights.....	10
2.1.9. Substitutions.....	10
Sampling errors.....	10
2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size.....	10
Non-sampling errors.....	11
2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors.....	11
2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors.....	12
2.3.2.1. Measurement errors.....	12
2.3.2.2. Processing errors.....	14
2.3.3. Non-response errors.....	15
2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size.....	15
2.3.3.2. Unit non-response.....	15
2.3.3.3. Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’ (DB120), by ‘household questionnaire result’ (DB130) and by ‘household interview acceptance’ (DB135).....	16
2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units.....	18
2.3.3.5. Item non-response.....	18
2.4. Mode of data collection.....	21
2.5. Interview duration.....	21
3. Comparability.....	22
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions.....	22
3.1.1. The reference population.....	22
3.1.2. The private household definition.....	22
3.1.3. The household membership.....	22
3.1.4. The income reference period.....	22
3.1.5. The period of taxes on income and social contributions.....	23

3.1.6. The reference period for taxes on wealth.....	23
3.1.7. The lag between the income reference period and current variables.....	23
3.1.8. The total duration of the data collection of the sample.....	23
3.1.9. Basic information on activity status during the income reference period.....	23
3.2. Components of income.....	23
3.2.1.1. Total household gross income.....	23
3.2.1.2. Total disposable household income.....	23
3.2.1.3. Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits.....	24
3.2.1.4. Total disposable household income, before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits.....	24
3.2.1.5. Imputed rent.....	24
3.2.1.6. Income from rental property and land.....	24
3.2.1.7. Family/children-related allowances.....	24
3.2.1.8. Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified.....	24
3.2.1.9. Housing allowances.....	24
3.2.1.10. Regular inter-household cash transfers received.....	25
3.2.1.11. Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business...	25
3.2.1.12. Interest paid on mortgages.....	25
3.2.1.13. Income received by people aged under 16.....	25
3.2.1.14. Regular taxes on wealth.....	25
3.2.1.15. Regular inter-household transfers paid.....	25
3.2.1.16. Tax on income and social contributions.....	25
3.2.1.17. Repayments and tax adjustments.....	25
3.2.1.18. Cash or near-cash employee income.....	25
3.2.1.19. Non-cash employee income.....	26
3.2.1.20. Employers' social contributions.....	26
3.2.1.21. Cash profits or losses from self-employment (including royalties).....	26
3.2.1.22. Value of goods produced for own consumption.....	26
3.2.1.23. Unemployment benefits.....	27
3.2.1.24. Old-age benefits.....	27
3.2.1.25. Survivors' benefits.....	27
3.2.1.26. Sickness benefits.....	27
3.2.1.27. Disability benefits.....	27
3.2.1.28. Education related allowances.....	27
3.2.1.29. Gross monthly earnings for employees.....	27
3.2.2. The source of collecting income variables.....	27
3.2.3. The form in which income target variables at component level were obtained.....	28
3.2.4. The method used for obtaining income target variables in required form.....	28
4. Coherence.....	29
4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each 'income component', with external sources.....	29
4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources.....	30

Background

2007 was the third year, when EU-SILC is carried out in Latvia. The Latvian EU-SILC survey is an annual survey with a four-year rotational panel and has been carried out as independent survey, covering both cross-section and longitudinal primary target variables and also secondary target variables by single operation.

1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators

Table 1.1. Laeken indicators and other indicators

Indicator	Value
Primary Laeken indicators of social cohesion	
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Total	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Males	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Females	23
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-17 total	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 total	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 males	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 females	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ total	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ males	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ females	24
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 total	17
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 males	16
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 females	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 total	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 males	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 females	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 total	16
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 males	17
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 females	16
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 total	23
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 males	23
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 females	23
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ total	33
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ males	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ females	39
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work total	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work males	9
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work females	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work total	38
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work males	37
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work females	39
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed total	57
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed males	66
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed females	47
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired total	38
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired males	28
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired females	42
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive total	31
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive males	35
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive females	29

Indicator	Value
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: No dependent children	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single total	59
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single males	51
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single females	62
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single <65 years	44
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single 65+	75
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults no children, <65 years	20
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults no children, 65+	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: All households with dependent children	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single parent	34
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 1 dependent child	12
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 2 dependent children	16
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 3+ dependent children	46
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Owner or rent-free	20
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Tenant	28
At-risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values, LVL per year): Single person	1 400
At-risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values, LVL per year): Two adults with two children younger than 14 years	2 939
Inequality of income distribution S80/S20 income quintile share ratio	6.3
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Total	25
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Males	27
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Females	24
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 0-17	28
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ total	24
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ males	27
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ females	23
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18-64 total	30
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18-64 males	32
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 16-64 females	28
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ total	19
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ males	12
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ females	19
Secondary Laeken indicators of social cohesion	
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 40% of median equivalised income, total	8
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 40% of median equivalised income, males	9
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 40% of median equivalised income, females	8
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 50% of median equivalised income, total	14
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 50% of median equivalised income, males	13
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 50% of median equivalised income, females	15
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 70% of median equivalised income, total	30
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 70% of median equivalised income, males	28
Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold: 70% of median equivalised income, females	32
At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005): Total	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005): Males	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005): Females	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers: Total	39
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers: Males	37
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers: Females	41
At-risk-of-poverty rate before transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits: Total	27
At-risk-of-poverty rate before transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits: Males	25
At-risk-of-poverty rate before transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits: Females	29
Gini coefficient	35
Other indicators	
Mean equivalised disposable income (LVL per year)	2 845

The calculation of gender pay gap is based on other sources than EU-SILC. Wage statistics is used for calculating gender pay gap.

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sampling Design

In Latvia stratified two-stage sampling design was used for EU-SILC survey. At the first stage systematic sampling of the primary sampling units (Population Census counting areas) had been selected. At the second stage simple random sampling had been made to select secondary sampling units (addresses). The stratification had been made depending on degree of urbanization of area. The code of administrative territories was used for stratifying.

Table 2.1. Sampling design information

Stratum	1st stage	2nd stage	
	PSU's	SSU's	Households
1	316	2 285	2 326
2	170	1 203	1 243
3	181	1 364	1 393
4	187	1 698	1 755
All	854	6 550	6 717

2.1.1. Type of sample design

Stratified two-stage sampling was used for EU-SILC survey in Latvia. Systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to unit size had been carried out at the first stage and simple random sampling had been carried out at the second stage.

2.1.2. Sampling units

The Population Census counting areas were used as primary sampling units (PSU's) at the first stage. In general, all territory of Latvia is covered in lists of population counting areas. PSU's were selected by systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to population size (number of households) of PSU's.

Addresses were used as secondary sampling units (SSU's). Simple random sampling was used to select SSU's from PSU's selected at first sampling stage. In Latvia several households can be registered in one address. All households and individuals living in the selected address were included in EU-SILC survey in the urban areas, but in the rural areas only those households, which were formed by persons enumerated in the Household List (see 2.3.2.1.). If none of persons enumerated in the Household List lived in the selected address, then it was possible:

- if interviewer knew the correct address of the persons enumerated in the Household List, then it was possible to go for interview to the different address in the same local area;
- to interview all households and individuals (other than enumerated in the Household List) living in the selected address (the same approach as in urban areas).

2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria

The stratification was made depending on degree of urbanization of area. Riga (the capital city), six largest towns, other towns and rural areas forms four strata. The code of administrative territories was used for stratifying. The stratum is identified in the variable DB050.

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

According to the Regulation (EC) No 1553/2005 of European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 amending Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 concerning Community statistics on income and living conditions (EU-SILC), Annex II in Latvia the minimum effective sample size is 3 750 households. The total gross sample size (number of households) has been made analysing non-response rates and design effects of previous EU-SILC surveys (in 2005 and 2006). To compensate the non-response it was decided to select 6 550 addresses. In Latvia more than one household can live in one address. Therefore, there were 6 717 households living in the selected addresses. In case if it was not possible to contact the selected address (address cannot be located, it was not possible to contact any person living in the address or the address was inaccessible, etc.) it was assumed that one household is living in selected address.

The response rates differ very much in each stratum. For this reason addresses were not included with probabilities proportional to stratum size, but the initial sample size was proportional to population size of each stratum. The initial sample size was adjusted according to response rates in each stratum to get the final sample size in each stratum. R_h is the number of persons aged 16 and over living in stratum h as at the beginning of 2007. n_h is number of respondents (aged 16 and over) of the stratum h and n_h / R_h is the sampling fraction in the corresponding stratum.

Table 2.2. Sampling fractions in the corresponding stratum

Stratum	R_h	n_h	n_h / R_h
1	601 601	2 527	0.0042
2	324 211	1 746	0.0054
3	345 384	2 026	0.0059
4	581 903	3 143	0.0054
Total	1 853 098	9 442	0.0051

2.1.5. Sample selection schemes

In the first stage 854 Population Census counting areas (PSU's) were selected by systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to their population size.

Simple random sampling without replacement was used to select 6 550 addresses (SSU's) in sampled PSU's. Non-proportional allocation was used to select SSU's.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

Sample distribution over time was not used because EU-SILC survey is organized on annual basis. The number of households successfully interviewed in each month of fieldwork is shown below in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3. Sample distribution over time

Month	Number of households	% of surveyed households	Cumulative % of surveyed households
February	17	0.4	0.4
March	504	11.3	12.2
April	278	6.2	18.7
May	370	8.3	27.3
June	241	5.4	32.9
July	773	17.3	51.0
August	833	18.6	70.5
September	942	21.1	92.5
October	295	6.6	99.4
November	27	0.6	100
Not specified	191	4.3	-
TOTAL:	4 471	100	100

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups

Latvia applies rotational panel where the sample is divided into four sub-samples. Each of them is representing whole population. Every year one of rotation group rotates out (is being dropped) and the new one is added to the sample.

2.1.8. Weightings

2.1.8.1. Design factor

The design weights (DB080) for addresses were calculated according the sample design:

$$DB080 = \frac{1}{prob_adr};$$

$$prob_adr = \frac{hhpsupop \cdot psustrat \cdot adrpsus}{hhstrpop \cdot adrp sup},$$

where *prob_adr* - inclusion probabilities of addresses;

hhpsupop - a number of households in each strata's each PSU of all population;

psustrat - a number of the PSU's in each strata of sample;

adrpsus - a number of addresses in each strata's each PSU of sample;

hhstrpop - a number of households in each strata of all population;

adrpsup - a number of addresses in each strata's each PSU of population.

The inclusion probability of the household and the individual is equal to the inclusion probability of the address. The design weights were adjusted for outliers (extremely high design weights) at the address level.

2.1.8.2. *Non-response adjustments*

The design weights adjusted for outliers *desig1_w* were adjusted for non-response (in household level) in each primary sampling unit (PSU) with correction coefficients *k2_k3* and *k4*:

$$k2_k3 = \frac{samplpsu \cdot cov_sum}{restppsu \cdot resp};$$

$$nonrespw = k2_k3 \cdot desig1_w;$$

$$k4 = \frac{m1}{m2};$$

$$nonr_w = nonrespw \cdot k4,$$

where ***samplpsu*** - a number of households in each PSU of sample;

cov_sum - a number of households useful for survey in each PSU of sample;

restppsu - a number of households in each PSU of sample, which belong to target population;

resp - a number of responded households in each PSU of sample;

m1 - a number of addresses in sample, which have at least one responded household;

m2 - a number of responded households in sample.

2.1.8.3. *Adjustments to external data (level, variables used and sources)*

Cross-sectional weights were calibrated on basis of demographic data by breaking it down by degree of urbanization (three groups — Riga, 6 large towns and others), 11 age groups (16-20; 21-25; 26-30; 31-35; 36-40; 41-45; 46-50; 51-55; 56-60; 61-65; 66+) and sex. Another variable was demographic data by 6 regions of Latvia. The final household weights were used both for households and for individuals. Separately were calibrated cross-sectional weights for children (variable RL070), demographic data by each of age from 0 to 12 were used.

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights

The final cross-sectional weights DB090 were calculated as the product of the design factor, non-response adjustment factor and calibration factor:

$$DB090 = nonr_w \cdot g,$$

where **g** - g-weights of the regression estimator.

2.1.9. Substitutions

No substitution was used.

2.2. Sampling errors

2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size

- **At-risk-of poverty rate and mean equivalised disposable income**

It was assumed that at-risk-of poverty rate is similar to ratio of two totals (ignoring that threshold is estimate from sample). Standard error and design effect for at-risk-of poverty rate were estimated as standard error and design effect for ratio. Standard error was estimated by using Taylor linearization method. The correction of finite population at PSU level was applied for variance estimate in each stratum. The same methodology was used for estimating standard error and design effect for mean equivalised disposable income.

- **Gini coefficient**

Linearization was applied for *Gini* coefficient. Standard error for *Gini* coefficient was estimated as standard error for total of linearized variable. The correction of finite population at PSU level was applied to variance estimate in each stratum.

- **Design effect**

Design effect was calculated as ratio of the variance for sampling design used in EU-SILC and the variance for simple random sampling of households.

- **Software**

The variance estimates and design effect were computed using the software SUDAAN and SPSS.

Table 2.4. Estimates, the standard error and design effect for common cross-sectional EU indicators

Indicator	Value	Achieved sample size	Standard error	Design effect	Effective sample size
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers	21	4 471	0.88	1.49	2 998
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits	27	4 471	0.99	1.61	2 779
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers	39	4 471	1.03	1.46	3 072
Gini coefficient	35	4 471	0.66	-	-
Mean equivalised disposable income	2 845	4 471	28.62	1.29	3 472

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

Two sampling frames are built for each sampling stage. At the first stage counting areas from the list of Population Census 2000 are used as sampling frame. All territory of Latvia was divided in small territories (smaller than NUTS4) during the Population Census 2000. The list contains information about the number of households in each counting area.

At the second stage sampling frame is built from The Population Register, statistical register of dwellings and statistical register of households.

Second stage sampling frame was built by using the copy of Population Register given at the beginning of year 2006. Both statistical register of dwellings and statistical register of households was updated by using the Population Register. Thus the time lag between last update of the registers and the moment of actual EU-SILC survey sampling was 12 months.

The over-coverage relates either to misclassified units that are in fact out of scope, or to units that do not exist in practice (i.e. address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)). Overall, over-coverage rate of total amount of addresses included in EU-SILC survey was 3.6 % (242 from 6 717 addresses).

Table 2.5. Distribution of over coverage

Type of over-coverage	Number of addresses	Proportion of the over-coverage by type, (%)
Address does not exist (DB120 = 231)	13	6.4
Non - residential address (DB120 = 232)	156	76.8
Address is unoccupied (DB120 = 233)	7	3.4
Address is not principal residence (DB120 = 234)	27	13.3
Total	203	100

There are 39 addresses, which are not identified by over-coverage reason; those were addresses of households, which were surveyed in previous year.

The level of under-coverage is not estimated.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

The same as in EU-SILC 2006 operation 3 types of questionnaires were developed for EU-SILC 2007 operation: Household Register (to collect demographic information about all household members), Household Questionnaire (to collect all information related to household – dwelling costs, housing conditions, income components received at household level etc.), Personal Questionnaire (to collect all needed information for each household member aged 16 and over in previous calendar year) and Household List (additional document to record all necessary information about household member for tracing purposes and for linkage with data from administrative registers). The household members' first, second names, contact addresses, phone numbers (fixed and mobile phone numbers) and personal identification codes were recorded in Household List. The Blaise CAPI applications as well as the paper questionnaires of EU-SILC survey were available in Latvian and in Russian (the language of the largest ethnic minority in Latvia).

The interviewers of CSB carried out the fieldwork of EU-SILC survey. For the field staff was organised a 2 days intensive training session. The aims of the training were to introduce fieldwork staff with methodology of EU-SILC survey, to instruct interviewers for accurate fieldwork execution of the survey and give them information to motivate respondents for participation in the survey. Special emphasis was put on training to work with laptop computers and using Blaise data entry application. Several tests (including practical interview to fill EU-SILC questionnaires) were developed to check interviewers' knowledge after training session.

To increase response rates several steps had been made to introduce Latvian residents with EU-SILC survey before starting fieldwork. Press release had been prepared; several publications had been made in state and regional newspapers to provide publicity of EU-SILC survey. Introduction letter with EU-SILC booklet was sent to selected address to establish first contact with household before interview.

There are several factors, which might give the negative impact to the quality of EU-SILC 2007 cross-sectional data:

- Questionnaires of EU-SILC 2007 contains the largest number of questions than ever before. Questions about net income and about gross income were asked to respondents. It was done in that way because possibility to use administrative data for making cross-sectional database of EU-SILC 2007 before fieldwork was unclear.
- interviewers had high workload;

- interviewer staff is changing very frequently, there are problems to train newcomers;
- there was constant lack of interviewers, especially in Riga and it's neighboured areas;
- interviewers were hesitating to use opportunity to agree the meeting time via phone;
- interviewer's training becomes ineffective if fieldwork lasts till autumn (in 2007 the training was carried out in middle of February).

Measurement errors had been detected by logical checks and verification of received data. Overall, the topic of EU-SILC survey was sensitive and important for respondents. Therefore, the respondent's attitude to the survey was quite different. Part of respondents had shown distrust to governmental institutions and expressed disbelief in improvement of living conditions in Latvia. Other part of respondent was very optimistic. They saw importance of EU-SILC survey to identify socio economical situation. In many cases the respondent's strong attitude burdened the interview process because people were speaking a lot about living conditions and quality of life in general and not answering the questions. Several problems have been identified in Interviewer's reports:

- old household members had difficulties to remember the year when highest level of education was attained and answer questions on last job;
- many respondents were not willing to tell truth amounts of main income components (Tables 2.6. and 2.7.);
- many respondents couldn't tell annual income amounts and housing costs;
- problems to encode some professions according ISCO-88 classification.

Table 2.6. Level of plausibility of answers about net and gross income given by respondents (from Interviewer's reports), in %

Information given by respondents was (according to the opinion of interviewer):	Net income	Gross income
With high level of plausibility	33.5	25.1
Approximate	42.5	45.7
With poor level of plausibility	14.0	17.6
Not plausible	10.1	11.6
TOTAL:	100	100

Table 2.7. Distribution of answers to question: “Did the respondents, which according to you might receive unofficial wages, open about received income?” (from Interviewer’s reports), in %

Respondents about this question were (according to the opinion of interviewer)	Respondents receiving unofficial wages
Open and identified precise amounts of unofficial wages	17.8
Open but identified approximate amounts of unofficial wages (because didn't know or didn't remember precise amounts)	29.4
Answered indirectly by telling amounts of unofficial wages unlikely to be truth	19.3
Strictly refused to tell amounts of unofficial wages or identified only official part of salary	33.6
TOTAL:	100

Interviewers were also complaining about length of questionnaire covering too much information. Several advantages of using laptops are mentioned: easier interviewing, many mistakes are avoided, laptops increase respect among respondents, interviewing with laptops is more prestige and also more convenient. Disadvantages of laptop are, that recharging during making interviews is very difficult (respondents are not willing to allow to recharge PC); it is heavy to carry the laptops all the time.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

2007 was the second year when CAPI by using BLAISE program is introduced. Comparing with 2006, CAPI data entry program was not changed significantly in 2007.

Several improvements were made in Household Register and additional checks and warnings about possible mistakes were introduced. But still 10.7% of personal interviews are completed using paper questionnaires. Paper questionnaires are used when laptop can't be used (for example, for security considerations, empty battery, etc.).

Overall BLAISE program has been designed successfully and it worked stable, except case when data of few full questionnaire sets were lost during the process of transmission data from laptop to central server. Data on these households couldn't be renewed and there are unknown reasons why data have been lost.

Remarkable number of logical checks as well as part of personal data from previous year of the survey has been introduced into the program. Nevertheless, it has noted that program had one defect: time registration have not been considered completely in cases when household data have been corrected, revised or supplemented for several times and in cases when interview was made by

using PAPI. Interviewers also reported some problems with transmission of data from laptop to central server, but this fact didn't influence interviewing.

Data have been transformed from BLAISE to MS ACCESS (modified version of application of 2006), where initial database has been analysed and corrected. Data from EU-SILC 2007 operation have been compared with data from previous EU-SILC operations, when it was possible. Compliance of the database with Eurostat requirements has been checked with SAS program.

2.3.3. *Non-response errors*

2.3.3.1. *Achieved sample size*

4 471 households interviews were accepted for the database and used for analysis.

There are 9 270 persons aged 16 years and older who are members of households for which the interview is accepted for the database, and who completed a personal interview.

2.3.3.2. *Unit non-response*

For the total sample (four rotational groups)

The final response rates were calculated according to formulas given by Eurostat:

- Household non-response rate $NRh = 24.4$
- Individual non-response rate $NRp = 1.8$
- Overall non-response rate $*NRp = 25.8$

For the new households (rotational group 4)

The final response rates were calculated according to formulas given by Eurostat:

- Household non-response rate $NRh = 37.3$
- Individual non-response rate $NRp = 2.1$
- Overall non-response rate $*NRp = 38.6$

2.3.3.3. *Distribution of households (original units) by 'record of contact at address' (DB120), by 'household questionnaire result' (DB130) and by 'household interview acceptance' (DB135)*

Table 2.8. Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address' (DB120) for each rotational group

	Rotational group 1		Rotational group 2		Rotational group 3		Rotational group 4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	913	100	1 129	100	1 403	100	2 714	100	6 159	100
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	900	98.6	1 112	98.5	1 384	98.6	2 372	87.4	5 768	93.7
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	13	1.4	17	1.5	19	1.4	342	12.6	391	6.3
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	13	100	17	100	19	100	342	100	391	100
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	1	7.7	2	11.8	1	5.3	14	4.1	18	4.6
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	38.3	131	33.5
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	12	92.3	15	88.2	18	94.7	197	57.6	242	61.9

It should be noticed, that 558 addresses have not been used and there is no information about them.

Table 2.9. Distribution of addresses contacted by 'household questionnaire result' and by 'household interview acceptance' for each rotational group

	Rotational group 1		Rotational group 2		Rotational group 3		Rotational group 4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total (DB130 = 11 to 24)	900	100	1 112	100	1 384	100	2 372	100	5 768	100
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	767	85.2	966	86.9	1 168	84.4	1 579	66.6	4 480	77.7
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	133	14.8	146	13.1	216	15.6	793	33.4	1 288	22.3
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	133	100	146	100	216	100	793	100	1 288	100
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	50	37.6	46	31.5	69	31.9	406	51.2	571	44.3
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork (DB130 = 22)	69	51.9	90	61.6	126	58.3	293	36.9	578	44.9
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc) (DB130 = 23)	6	4.5	4	2.7	9	4.2	21	2.6	40	3.1
Other (DB130 = 24)	8	6.0	6	4.1	12	5.6	73	9.2	99	7.7
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1 to 2)	767	100	966	100	1 168	100	1 579	100	4 480	100
Interview accepted to database (DB135 = 1)	762	99.3	965	99.9	1 167	99.9	1 577	99.9	4 471	99.8
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	5	0.7	1	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.1	9	0.2

It should be noticed, that 558 addresses have not been used and there is no information about them.

2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units

Substitution was not used.

2.3.3.5. Item non-response

The tables below show the amount following information on each income component at personal and at household level:

- percentage of persons/households having received an amount of income (other than 0);
- percentage of persons/households having received an income but with no information about amount of the received income have been obtained from the questionnaire (missing value);
- percentage of persons/households providing partial information about income variable in the questionnaire (responding part of questions related to income amounts).

Table 2.10. Distribution of item non-response for income variables collected at household level

Income variable	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
Total household gross income (HY010)	99.2	8.2	90.0
Total disposable household income (HY020)	99.5	6.3	91.6
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits (HY022)	98.8	7.0	92.9
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits (HY023)	88.7	5.3	94.7
Net income components at household level			
Imputed rent (HY030N)	94.7	100	0
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040N)	1.4	3.3	0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business (HY090N)	1.1	29.8	0
Family/Children related allowances (HY050N)	33.2	22.3	36.7
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060N)	5.7	37.0	10.5
Housing allowances (HY070N)	3.8	9.5	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received (HY080N)	11.8	8.1	0
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100N)	2.1	100	0
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110N)	1.0	17.8	0
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120N)	52.6	6.3	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid (HY130N)	8.7	9.0	0
Tax on income and social contributions (HY140N)	68.4	13.0	85.2

Income variable	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
Gross income components at household level			
Imputed rent (HY030G)	94.7	100	0
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040G)	1.4	3.3	0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business (HY090G)	1.1	29.8	0
Family/Children related allowances (HY050G)	33.2	22.3	36.7
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060G)	5.7	37.0	10.5
Housing allowances (HY070G)	3.8	9.5	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received (HY080G)	11.8	8.1	0
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100G)	2.1	100	0
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110G)	1.0	17.8	0
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120G)	52.6	6.3	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid (HY130G)	8.7	9.0	0
Tax on income and social contributions (HY140G)	68.4	13.0	85.2

Table 2.11. Distribution of item non-response for income variables collected at personal level

Income variable	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons 16+ with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons 16+ with partial information (before imputation)
Net income components at personal level			
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	57.2	19.8	0.7
Non-cash employee income (PY020N)	3.6	37.2	11.8
Company car (PY021N)	0.9	100	0
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035N)	1.0	12.9	0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050N)	4.3	6.5	0.7
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (PY070N)	17.8	100	0
Pension from individual private plans (PY080N)	0.1	0	0
Unemployment benefits (PY090N)	5.2	75.1	21.4
Old-age benefits (PY100N)	32.2	7.6	91.2
Survivor's benefits (PY110N)	1.7	63.5	34.6
Sickness benefits (PY120N)	7.8	76.1	20.9
Disability benefits (PY130N)	4.3	28.2	63.5
Education-related benefits (PY140N)	1.5	6.3	0

Income variable	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons 16+ with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons 16+ with partial information (before imputation)
Gross income components at personal level			
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	57.2	19.8	76.9
Non-cash employee income (PY020G)	3.6	37.2	11.8
Company car (PY021G)	0.9	100	0
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	1.0	12.9	0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050G)	4.3	6.5	10.2
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (PY070G)	17.8	100	0
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	0.1	0	0
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	5.2	75.1	21.4
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	32.2	18.6	80.1
Survivor's benefits (PY110G)	1.7	63.5	34.6
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	7.8	84.1	12.9
Disability benefits (PY130G)	4.3	36.3	55.8
Education-related benefits (PY140G)	1.5	6.3	0

Missing values of income components were filled using imputation methods. Multiple imputation method in combination with Hot Deck method was chosen for imputation of missing values in EU-SILC survey. The main principle of the Hot Deck method is to use the current data (donors) to provide imputed values for records with missing values.

Before imputation data of households was divided in similar groups by type of dwelling, year the dwelling was built and number of rooms in dwelling. Data of individuals were divided in similar groups by sex, person's family status and person's social status. After this distribution we obtained all groups of households and persons with similar income level. This factor improved imputation results.

At the end of March 2008 (some files in the middle of April 2008) according to the signed agreement micro-data files regarding pensions and benefits paid to EU-SILC 2007 respondents (during 2006) were received from State Social Insurance Agency (SSIA). It was decided to substitute pensions and benefits collected during EU-SILC survey (both net and gross income components were collected) with data from SSIA, but there are still some minor benefits, which are administrated by local municipalities or pensions paid by other countries and service pensions, which are not administrated by SSIA, etc. Thus imputation factor to the large extent shows the difference between collected data and data from administrative registers (recorded value in the data files).

2.4. Mode of data collection

Table 2.12. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by Data status (RB250) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AGED 16 AND OVER (RB245 = 1)

	Total	RB250 = 11	RB250 = 12	RB250 = 13	RB250 = 21	RB250 = 22	RB250 = 23	RB250 = 31	RB250 = 32	RB250 = 33
Total	9 442	0	0	9 270	5	0	63	73	30	1
%	100	0	0	98.2	0.1	0	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.0
Rotational group 1	1 642	0	0	1 622	2	0	3	11	4	0
%	100	0	0	98.8	0.1	0	0.2	0.7	0.2	0
Rotational group 2	2 053	0	0	2 026	1	0	8	10	8	0
%	100	0	0	98.7	0.0	0	0.4	0.5	0.4	0
Rotational group 3	2 472	0	0	2 415	0	0	22	25	10	0
%	100	0	0	97.7	0	0	0.9	1.0	0.4	0
Rotational group 4	3 275	0	0	3 207	2	0	30	27	8	1
%	100	0	0	97.9	0.1	0	0.9	0.8	0.2	0.0

Table 2.13. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by Type of interview (RB260) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AGED 16 AND OVER ((RB245 = 1) and (RB250 = 11 or 13))

	Total	RB260 = 1	RB260 = 2	RB260 = 3	RB260 = 4	RB260 = 5
Total	9 259	991	7 112	655	5	496
%	100	10.7	76.8	7.1	0.1	5.4
Rotational group 1	1 621	92	1 271	159	0	99
%	100	5.7	78.4	9.8	0	6.1
Rotational group 2	2 021	239	1 497	152	1	132
%	100	11.8	74.1	7.5	0.0	6.5
Rotational group 3	2 413	210	1 936	144	2	121
%	100	8.7	80.2	6.0	0.1	5.0
Rotational group 4	3 204	450	2 408	200	2	144
%	100	14.0	75.2	6.2	0.1	4.5

It should be noticed, that for 11 household members aged 16 and over value in “Type of interview” (RB260) is missing.

2.5. Interview duration

Mean duration of household interview: 16 minutes and 23 seconds.

Mean interview duration per household: 32 minutes and 34 seconds.

Thus, mean interview duration per household is lower than the one-hour limit set in Regulation No 1177/2003.

It should be noticed that information about duration of households interview was available for 85% of households and 43% of household member aged 16 and over.

3. Comparability

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

Overall, there are no differences between national interpretations of EU-SILC basic definitions and concepts and common standards set up in Commission regulations and doc. EU-SILC 065/05.1. Special attention has been paid on definition of household member during data collection of EU-SILC survey in 2007. Most typical cases faced by interviewers in previous years of EU-SILC survey have been described more comprehensively according to common definitions.

3.1.1. *The reference population*

There were no divergences from common definition. Persons living in private households within national territory were the reference population of EU-SILC survey.

3.1.2. *The private household definition*

There were no divergences from common definition.

3.1.3. *The household membership*

There were no divergences from common definition. Due to the complexity of household membership several practical and comprehensive explanations based on concrete cases (examples) were given to interviewers. After entering European Union many Latvian residents goes to work abroad but at the same time they are keeping ties with family and plan to return home after some time period (which very often is unspecified). The previous experience of EU-SILC survey and other surveys has shown that this situation occurs in many Latvian households. Therefore, it was very important to provide more detailed and strict explanations in which cases person working abroad should be considered a household member.

Other typical case is youngsters who are moving from rural areas to towns for study purposes. Mostly they are living in towns for study time and go back home in holidays. In this situation proper identification of household membership is very important.

3.1.4. *The income reference period*

There were no divergences from common definition. In Latvia the income reference period is previous calendar year (2006).

3.1.5. *The period of taxes on income and social insurance contributions*

2007 was first year when information about gross income data was collected. In Latvia the taxes and social insurance contributions refer to the income received during the income reference period (2006). The only exception is repayments or receipts for tax adjustment. These are taxes and social insurance contributions, which are received/paid during the income reference period, but may refer to previous years. Before 2007 those repayments/receipts were included in variable HY145N (as Latvia was authorized not to deliver any gross income data before 2007), but now they are included in variable HY140 (tax on income and social contributions).

3.1.6. *The reference period for taxes on wealth*

In Latvia the reference period for taxes on wealth refer to the income received during the income reference period (2006).

3.1.7. *The lag between the income reference period and current variables*

The lag between end of income reference period and current variables is from 2 to 10 months.

3.1.8. *The total duration of the data collection of the sample*

Fieldwork (data collection) started in the middle of February 2007 and lasted till the beginning of November 2007.

3.1.9. *Basic information on activity status during the income reference period*

There were no divergences from common definitions.

3.2. *Components of income*

Classification of net and gross income components in national EU-SILC survey is made according to description of doc. EU-SILC 065/05.1. As Latvia had derogation to collect gross income components, 2007 was first year when gross income components were collected.

3.2.1.1 *Total household gross income*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.2. *Total disposable household income*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.3. *Total disposable household income, before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards, but, as we have provided income components of gross and net series, total disposable household income, before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits was calculated from variable HY020 using only net income components (as it was done before 2007).

3.2.1.4. *Total disposable household income, before social transfers including old age and survivor's benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards, but, as we have provided income components of gross and net series, total disposable household income, before social transfers including old age and survivor's benefits was calculated from variable HY020 using only net income components (as it was done before 2007).

3.2.1.5. *Imputed rent*

Using the experience gained from the calculation of imputed rent for Household Budget survey it was decided to use log-linear regression model for calculation of imputed rent also for EU-SILC. Following variables were used for calculation of imputed rent:

- tenure discount;
- urban / rural area;
- region;
- area of dwelling in square metres.

3.2.1.6. *Income from rental property and land*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.7. *Family/children-related allowances*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.8. *Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.9. *Housing allowances*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.10. Regular inter-household cash transfers received

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.11. Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.12. Interest paid on mortgages

There are no divergences from common standards.

Interest paid on mortgages was not asked directly to the household respondent, but it was calculated from the answers to the questions about:

- the average payment per month;
- the average mortgage interest rate;
- year, when dwelling was purchased;
- duration of mortgage loan.

3.2.1.13. Income received by people aged under 16

There are no divergences from common standards. Basically there are included wages and salaries received during holidays or out of school time.

3.2.1.14. Regular taxes on wealth

There are no divergences from common standards. Taxes on land and real estate are included in this variable.

3.2.1.15. Regular inter-household transfers paid

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.16. Tax on income and social contributions

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.17. Repayments/receipts for tax adjustments

There are no divergences from common standards. Included in variable HY140.

3.2.1.18. Cash or near-cash employee income

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.19. *Non-cash employee income*

There are no divergences from common standards.

Special method has been used to evaluate the non-cash employee income from use of company car for personal purposes. According to Latvian situation method based on system analyses model has been chosen for calculating employee non-cash income from use company car for personal purposes. Components for calculating monetary value of this non-cash employee have been included in questionnaires and collected directly from respondents: class of the car, year of the car make, total amount of kilometres driven by company car in previous calendar year (2006), annual amount of kilometres driven by the vehicle for private use, company car user's occupation, coverage of car related costs made by employer: fuel, car's technical inspection, tire purchase (i.e. did the employer pay bills for fuel purchasing, car's technical inspection, tire purchase), restrictions of use of company car (i.e. if employer created restrictions to employee for use of private care for personal purposes). It was assumed that employer covered all costs related to use of company car for the employee's personal use.

3.2.1.20. *Employers' social contributions*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.21. *Cash profits or losses from self-employment (including royalties)*

The net income and losses from self-employment are collected in 2 components: 1) net income or losses from agricultural production and 2) net income or losses of the rest self-employment activities (except income from agricultural production). Both net income components were asked to each household member in age of 16 years and over (in income reference period) in Personal Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to tell net amount of self-employment income they had for personal use (incl. making private savings) or losses from self-employment activities during income reference period. There were also the questions about paid taxes to evaluate the gross income.

3.2.1.22. *Value of goods produced for own consumption*

The value of goods produced for own consumption was calculated using the information from Household Budget Survey. Household member responsible for agricultural production was asked to pick the products, which household produced for own consumption during income reference period, from the list (obtained from Household Budget Survey). This question was asked only to those households, which used the land for certain types of agricultural activity. Depending on the size of household and consumed products, the value of goods produced for own consumption was

calculated. Value of goods produced for own consumption was counted to responsible household member.

3.2.1.23. *Unemployment benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.24. *Old-age benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.25. *Survivors' benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.26. *Sickness benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.27. *Disability benefits*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.28. *Education related allowances*

There are no divergences from common standards.

3.2.1.29. *Gross monthly earnings for employees*

Value is not recorded as Latvia uses wage statistics for calculating gender pay gap.

3.2.2. *The source of collecting income variables*

Interviews were used for collecting both (gross and net) income variables. Household income variables (such as imputed rent, income from rental property and land, family/ children related allowances, housing allowances etc.) were collected from household respondent, which is responsible for issues related to dwelling and whole household. Exception was income from interest, dividends/ profit from capital investment. This variable together with all personal income variables (such as employee income, self-employment income, education related allowances, unemployment benefits etc.) was collected from each household member eligible for personal interview.

In EU-SILC 2006 Latvia started to use data from SSIA in EU-SILC survey. Data from SSIA was used for old-age benefits. After EU-SILC 2007 fieldwork CSB of Latvia received the data from

SSIA and data from State Revenue Service (SRS) were also available. Both data sources (data from respondents and data from SSIA and SRS) were checked and validated. In the result it was decided to use data from SSIA and to some extent from SRS in EU-SILC survey. It was decided to substitute pensions and benefits collected during EU-SILC survey (both net and gross income components were collected) with data from SSIA, but there are still some minor benefits, which are administrated by local municipalities or pensions paid by other countries and service pensions, which are not administrated by SSIA, etc. Thus imputation factor to the large extent shows the difference between collected data and data from administrative registers (recorded value in the data files).

The exception is net employee cash or near cash income (PY010N), which is available as well from SRS, but it was decided to use information from questionnaires. Gross employee cash or near cash income (PY010G) was obtained counting up net employee cash or near cash income from questionnaires with paid taxes from SRS. Obtained gross employee cash or near cash income was compared with gross employee cash or near cash income from questionnaires, thus obtaining imputation factor, which is recorded in PY010G_F.

3.2.3. The form in which income target variables at component level were obtained

See 3.2.2.

3.2.4. The method used for obtaining income target variables in required form

See 3.2.2.

4. Coherence

In this section will be compared the EU-SILC data with various external data sources: the Household Budget Survey (HBS), the Labour Force Survey (LFS), wage statistics and social protection statistics.

The HBS is continuous survey of households, which has been carried out since 1995. The annual net sample size is approximately 4 thousand households. The HBS is designed to collect information on consumption expenditure of households (information on income is collected to divide households in quintile groups). The HBS was the source of Laeken indicators until introduction of EU-SILC (in 2005).

The LFS is a continuous survey, which has been carried out according to a common EU methodology since 1995. The annual sample size is about 30 thousand person aged 15 - 74. The LFS is the main source for labour market information.

4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each 'income component' with external sources

In EU-SILC the average monthly employee cash or near cash income (PY010) was 255 LVL. In wage statistics this figure is lower – 216 LVL. Data of EU-SILC survey has been calculated for respondent, who received employee cash or near cash income (PY010) and who has been working as employee (full-time) at least one month during the income reference period (PL210). The acquired results show that EU-SILC data by 18% exceeded enterprise statistical data on average labour income amount in 2006 (by 21 % in 2005). The higher estimates from EU-SILC are due to the fact that in EU-SILC the average wages and salaries are calculated for persons receiving income, whereas in wage statistics the unit of enumeration is the job. Thus, in EU-SILC all employee income is counted into one variable (income from main job, second, third etc.), whereas in wage statistics, the wages from second, third etc. job are counted separately. It should be also taken into account that wage statistics is based on the information provided by the employers and for a certain cases it corresponds to part of wages from which have been deducted taxes (information about informal employee income might be left behind).

Table 4.1. presents the number of persons receiving income components in EU-SILC, HBS and in additional external sources. It should be taken into account that in HBS part of income components are obtained only at the household level and for this reason comparisons are made only among those income components, which are obtained in the same way as in EU-SILC. Besides, definitions of

income components can vary between sources and for that reason only the components for which sufficiently comparable definitions are presented in the table below.

Table 4.1. Number of persons receiving several income components in 2006

EU-SILC target variable	EU-SILC	HBS	Other sources
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	1 130 963	994 960	948 969 ¹
Old-age benefits (PY100N)	472 200	478 062	472 140 ²
Survivor's benefits (PY110N)	25 355	21 631	25 945 ³
Disability benefits (PY130N)	78 142	62 420	66 714 ²

¹ Wage statistics

² At the end of year, Social protection statistics (the State Social Insurance Agency) data

³ At the end of year, Social protection statistics (the State Social Insurance Agency data), recipients all age groups, including persons aged below 16 years.

In EU-SILC the number of people receiving employee income is by 182 thousand higher than in the wage statistics and by 136 thousand higher than in HBS. It is not unexpected, because unofficial work relationships are not included in wage statistics.

Comparing data on employees net wage (table 4.2.) we can see that EU-SILC data lightly better represent employees with comparatively higher wages and salaries (above LVL 200 per month).

Table 4.2. Employees' in age between 16 and 74 years monthly net wages in 2006

	EU-SILC	LFS ¹
Employees	100	100
Of which by wage (in LVL):		
under 81.01	6.3	9.8
81.01-100.00	9.1	12.2
100.01-150.00	18.6	22.3
150.01-200.00	15.4	20.3
200.01-300.00	24.6	17.8
300.01-500.00	18.2	8.3
500.01-750.00	4.4	1.5
750.01-1000.00	1.7	0.6
1000.01 and more	0.7	0.4
Wage was not calculated	x	2.0
Wage was calculated but not paid	x	1.1
Unspecified	x	3.7
No employee cash or near cash income reported	0.9	x

¹ Main job, in age 15-74

4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources

Important background indicator is a mean size of household. The official statistics in this area is based on the Population Census data. For the periods between the censuses it is based on calculations. According to these calculations, in 2007 the mean household size was 2.5 persons. Data on the mean size of households are given in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Mean size of household in 2007

	Population statistics	EU-SILC	HBS
Mean size of household, persons	2.5	2.64	2.55

A comparison of data shows that such survey as EU-SILC probably under-represents single-person households and other households with a small number of persons. The risk of failing to make contacts with these households is much higher.

A comparison of the breakdown of households by the number of persons in household (Table 4.4), by age of household members (Table 4.5) and by demographical type of household (Table 4.6) does not show any substantial differences.

Table 4.4. Distribution of households by size in 2007

	EU-SILC		HBS	
	%	number of households, in thousands	%	number of households, in thousands
All households	100	844.1	100	875.1
of which by number of members:				
1 person	25.1	212.1	23.6	206.6
2 persons	27.0	227.6	31.5	276.0
3 persons	22.8	192.7	22.7	198.8
4 persons	14.5	122.3	14.3	125.0
5 persons and more	10.6	89.5	7.8	68.6

Table 4.5. Distribution of household's member by age (in per cent) in 2007

	EU-SILC	HBS
All household members	100	100
of which by age brackets		
0-15	16.9	16.1
16-24	13.3	13.5
25-49	36.0	35.8
50-64	17.7	17.9
65+	16.0	16.7

Table 4.6. Distribution of households by demographical type (in per cent) in 2007

	EU-SILC	HBS
All households	100	100
of which:		
One person	25.1	23.6
of which:		
below the age of 65	13.1	11.0
over the age of 65	12.0	12.6
Couple without children	15.1	21.6
One adult with children	4.5	2.9
Couple with 1 child	9.2	10.6
Couple with 2 children	5.1	6.3
Couple with 3 and more children	1.5	1.2
Other households with children	15.2	11.4
Other households without children	24.2	22.4

Table 4.7. presents the distribution of population by ISCED level in EU-SILC and in LFS. As it can be seen, there are differences in overall distribution, but they are not substantial. It should be noted that in EU-SILC survey information of Personal Questionnaire was missing about 2.2% persons in age between 16 and 74 years. This represents 37.7 thousand persons of overall population in this age. Due to lack of personal information (P file data) about these persons in EU-SILC survey there could be differences in both data sources (EU-SILC and LFS).

Table 4.7. Distribution of population in age between 16 and 74 years by ISCED level in 2007

	EU-SILC		LFS ¹	
	thousand of persons	%	thousand of persons	%
ISCED 0	2.1	0.1	4.8	0.3
ISCED 1	35.6	2.2	68.5	3.8
ISCED 2	374.5	22.7	389.8	21.6
ISCED 3	792.0	47.9	904.6	50.2
ISCED 4	152.5	9.2	97.6	5.4
ISCED 5	293.0	17.7	327.2	18.1
ISCED 6	2.7	0.2	3.2	0.2
Total	1 652.5	100	1 803.6²	100

¹ In age 15-74

² Number of persons without education and number of persons, what have not indicated the level of education, are included in the total

Tables 4.8. – 4.10. represents socio-economic status of household member and those who are in employment. There are no significant differences between EU-SILC and data of other surveys. Emerging differences are probably related to the fact that the main activity status is entirely self-defined in EU-SILC at the time of interview, whereas in the LFS self-defined activity status refers to the last three months.

Table 4.8. Distribution of household members by socio-economic status (in per cent) in 2007

	EU-SILC	HBS
All household members	100	100
of which:		
At work	47.1	49.8
Unemployed	4.8	3.3
In retirement or early retirement	18.9	20.5
Other inactive person	29.2	26.4

Table 4.9. Distribution of population in age between 16 and 74 years by self-defined economic status in 2007

	EU-SILC		LFS	
	thousand of persons	%	thousand of persons	%
Working	1 025.4	62.0	1 100.8	62.1
Unemployed	83.5	5.0	96.2	5.4
Pupil, student	137.1	8.3	164.5	9.3
In retirement	264.3	16.0	255.2	14.4
Permanently disabled	34.9	2.1	54.8	3.1
Domestic task	82.8	5.0	64.1	3.6
Other inactive	26.7	1.6	36.7	2.1
Total	1 654.7	100	1 772.2	100

Table 4.10. Status of employed population in the main job in 2007

	EU-SILC	LFS
Age	16+	15-74
All employed	100	100
Employees (workers)	94.3	89.4
Employers (owners)	1.7	3.2
Self-employed	3.4	5.8
Unpaid person who helps another member of the family in enterprise or private practice, craft or farm work	0.6	1.6

Table 4.11. presents the share of households by the type of dwelling. The differences between the two data sources are small.

Table 4.11. Distribution of households by the type of dwelling in 2007

	EU-SILC	HBS
Detached house	22.8	24.6
Semi-detached house or terraced house	5.3	5.0
Apartment or flat	71.6	69.7
Other kind of accommodation	0.2	0.7
Total	100	100